I. — *Latin Word-Studies.*

BY PROF. EDWIN W. FAY,

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

(1) *accersit or arcessit.*

WALDE, in his *Latein. etym. Woert.*, *s.v. arcessit*, avows a preference for Brugmann's (*IF.* XIII, 88 *sq.*) derivation from **arfacessit* 'herbeischafft' as compared with Thurneysen's (*Archiv*, XIII, 36 *sq.*) from **arvocessit*. To the derivation from **arvocesso* Brugmann raises both phonetic and semantic objections, waiving the latter, however, in view of Eng. *hales* (= 'drags into court, summons') : Lat. *calat* 'summons,' Gr. καλεῖ 'calls.' In view of *calfacere* (Cato, Petronius), from *calĕfacere, calēfacere*, the phonetic difficulties might also seem solvable, — *arcesso*, from **arucesso*, from **arvocasso ;* but the form *-vocesso* is itself gratuitous.

There are, however, psycho-phonetic difficulties in the reduction of **arfacesso* to *arcesso*. It would seem that com-pound verbs are so liable to "recomposition" that in only four cases[1] have they entirely lost a representative of their root vowel, viz. : in *surpere* (: *rapere;* cf. *usurpare ?*), *pergere, porgere, surgere* (: *regere*), in all of which the group, vowel + *-rr-* + short vowel, was reduced to vowel + *-r-* (see Vendryes, *Intensité,* p. 261). A semantic difficulty with the **arfacesso* derivation is to account for the change from *facessit* 'makes

---

[1] The compounds of *iacit* exhibit *-icit,* and are on a somewhat different footing.

off' (neuter) to *arcessit* 'fetches, brings' (causative, not merely transitive, *pace* Brugmann, *l.c.* p. 94).

The most satisfactory derivation, as I see it, starts with *accersit* and connects with Skr. *kárṣati* 'trahit, arat.' This explanation is older than Pott, who seemed to pooh-pooh it in his *Forschungen*, I. 699, but again coquetted with it, *ibid.* IV, 361. Latterly this etymology has been defended by Nazari, in *Riv. di Filologia*, XXIX, 269. Nazari's startform is **arcersit*, rightly criticised by Walde, *l.c.*, p. 698. To justify the *-rs-* of *-cersit* Nazari derives from **cerssit* (see on the verb suffix *-so-* Brugmann, *KvGr.* § 678–679), but we might also operate with a base s)KERĀˣ-S-, whence a present stem s)KER -ES-, reduced in Latin to *cers-*. True, for the Sanskrit forms the base KERS- (Hirt, *Ablaut*, § 723), *i.e.* KER-S- (Walde, *s.v. curro* writes KERE-S), is sufficient, but this does not assure us that in other linguistic territory a base KERĀˣ-S- may not be found (cf. Reichelt, *KZ.* XXXIX, 31 *sq.*).

Either of these ways of accounting for *-rs-* in Latin ought to satisfy, so far as *-cersit* is concerned, all who do not still yield allegiance to the comparison of Skr. *karṣū́s* 'furrow, pit' with Gr. τέλσον 'turn-row,' an identification now given up by Prellwitz in the second edition of his *Woerterbuch*.

There is no cogent historical proof that *arcessit* is an older form than *accersit*, and the contention that the *-r-* of *arcessit*, while it was yielding to the analogical influences of compounds in *ac-c-*, sprang forward and produced *accersit* seems to me, as to Nazari, very improbable. On the other hand, assuming that *accersit* was the genuine old form of the word, the reverse process seems to me likely. Pairs like *prorsus / prosus, rursus / rusus* attest a period in the history of the Latin language when secondarily derived *-rs-* threatened to yield to *-s-*; and periods of fluctuation, of begun but arrested phonetic change, imply a certain popular consciousness of the shifting pronunciation. Accordingly, I assume that an individual language-user may have had it upon his mind whether he should pronounce the new (and perhaps slightly "tabooed") **accessit* or the old (and "standard")

accersit; the result of his hesitation was *arcessit,* which he may have reached through **arcersit.* The process was psycho-phonetic, identical in principle with " anticipation," say vowel-infection in Old Irish, Germanic Umlaut.[1]

From my own speech experience I can cite an almost perfectly analogous case: a favorite flower of my boyhood was the yellow jessamine, and about the time I went to college I began to affect " jasmine " for " jessamine," with the result that I often caught myself saying " yallow jasmine." [2]   So one halting between " accersit " and " accessit " may have fallen into **arcersit* and *arcessit.*

It remains to speak in conclusion of the general semantic problem involved.   Skr. *kársati* 'pulls, drags' has even been separated — in Cappeller's lexicon, for instance — from *kársati* 'ploughs.'   But inasmuch as the same meanings are found associated in Gr. ἕλκει 'pulls, draws' : Lat. *sulcus* 'furrow,' O. Eng. *sulh* ' plough,' this separation must not pass unchallenged.   The parallelism of the ἕλκει-group and the *kársati*-group is thorough-going, cf. ἑλκόμενος (Aristophanes, *Nub.* 1004) '[ad iudices] accersitus,' ἕλκω σε (*ib.* 1218) 'te [ad iudices] accersam.'   The question arises whether 'pulls' or 'ploughs' is the prior meaning.   Easy as it seems to be to derive the sense of 'pulls' from 'ploughs' (*i.e.* pulls the plough), on the other hand KERS- ' to plough ' would seem but a simple extension of S)KER- 'to pierce, cut, shave, scrape.' Here let us consider Germ. *reisst,* which offers a curiously exact parallel, for it occurs in the technical language of the farmer in the locution *einen acker reissen* = ' wuest gelegenen Boden zum ersten Male pfluegen ' (Heyne's *Woert. s.v.*), and the ordinary meaning is ' mit Gewalt ziehen oder auseinander gehen.'   According to Paul, *Deutsches Woert.,* the fundamental sense is ' einen Einschnitt worin machen '; and a further development, traced in detail by Paul, yields ' *zerren* ' (= ' heftig ziehen ').   Again, *zerrt* is a specialization of *zehrt*

---

[1] Vowel assimilation in Latin sometimes proceeded, it must be admitted, from beginning to end of a word, but then chiefly had the effect of a resistance to vowel weakening (see Brugmann, *KvGr.* § 331, B).

[2] But the other day, speaking of a ' bang-fringe,' I miscalled it ' bange-fring.'

'zerreisst' (: δέρει 'flays, tears ');[1] cf. also Germ. *raufen*, *rupfen* 'to pluck, pull' : Lat. *rumpit*. In line with the above, we may put ἕλκος 'wound, sore' and Skr. *sṛkás* 'lance' in the ἕλκει-group.

Here a general word on semantic questions, à propos of Walde's separation of Lat. *caedit* from *scindit* (see *s.v.*), because the former means 'schlaegt,' and the latter 'spaltet.' True, 'strikes' and 'splits' may seem very different to us now, but both acts are performed with an axe, and develop alike from a sense 'axes.' The chief difference between *caedit* and *scindit* is that *scindit* is especially set apart for chopping in the long rather than the cross direction; but we may note Ital. *largo* 'broad'/Span. *largo* 'long,' specializations of Lat. *largus* 'copious, abundant.'

In questions of semantics a good motto is *cherchez le dénominatif;* for whether the verb was denominative to start with (as I often think) or not, the cognate nouns are perpetually engrafting their senses on the verb (Brugmann, *Gr.* II, § 794, Anm. 1).

By all means precision in definition, but not a precision too narrow for the facts of usage. As to the notion 'cutting,' two French verbs are of interest, as showing how very restricted the notion may be to start with, and how generalized it may become. Thus Fr. *couper* starts with Graeco-Latin *colapum* 'a slap or blow on the face'; but now the developed verb has a range indicated by the following definitions: 'to lop, cut, fell, cut out, clip, pare, cut away, intercept, divide, chop.' Similarly from Lat. *talea* 'shoot, cutting,' comes *tailler* 'to lop, trim, prune, cut, cut out, carve, hew.'[2] If in neither of these verbs the sense 'to split' is

---

[1] In connection with *zerren*, the suggestion comes to me that Germ. *zer-* 'apart, asunder,' comes from DER- 'to split,' and is comparable with the other preverb *los-* (see *AJP.* XXVI, 173, n. 1). A verb like *zerreissen* looks very much like a composite of *zerren* and *reissen*. The final solution of the problem rests, of course, with the interpretation of O.H.G. *zer-*. The English preverb of similar meaning is *to-* (see Skeat, *s.v.*), which may be derived from the base DĔ(Y)-/DŎ(W)- 'to split' (see *AJP. ib.* 178 n.).

[2] Keller, *Latein. Etym.*, p. 113, assumes a low Latin verb **taliare*, citing Varro's (*ap.* Nonium, 414, 30) *intertaliare*.

reached, yet it is in *briser* 'to break,' intransitive 'split,' and
we may imagine this intransitive turned causative. The
sphere for an interchange of the ideas of *caedit* and *scindit*
is stone working, — the neolithic stage, to wit, — where chop-
ping is as much 'splitting' as 'striking'; cf. the locutions *erz
hauen* ('einschneidend schlagen') and *erz scheiden* (: *scin-
dere*). The generalized sense of 'divide' arises for most verbs
of 'cutting,' and from 'divide' back to the concrete 'split'
is an easy step; thus the substantial identity of *secat mare*
with *findit mare* might give to *secat* a concrete use as 'splits,
cleaves.' English *cleaves* does in fact mean 'scindit,' and its
Greek etymon γλύφει 'sculpat' may be rendered in Latin by
'caedit, incidit' (cf. particularly *caelum* ['engraver's] chisel').
The specific senses of *scindit* 'findit' and *caedit* 'secat' are
combined in Lucretius' (i, 533) findi in bina secando.

(2) ἀνάγκη : *necesse.*

The old comparison between ἀνάγκη and *necesse* has been
given up by the latest authorities (see Prellwitz and Walde
in their lexica). But neither word enjoys an entirely satisfac-
tory definition in its current explanation. Thus we have to
regard ἀνάγκη : ἐνεγκεῖν 'portare' as a sort of imperious, not
vacillating, Fortuna (: *ferre* 'portare'), — which were all very
well if we did not have to account for ἀνάγκη 'tie of blood';
οἱ ἀναγκαῖοι 'necessarii, affines, connections'; τὸ ἀναγκαῖον
'prison'; δεσμὸς ἀναγκαῖος (Theocritus) 'vinculum necessa-
rium'; cf. also ἦμαρ ἀναγκαῖον (*Il.* xvi, 836) 'day of enslave-
ment, bondage'; ἀναγκαία τύχη (Sophocles, *Ajax* 485) 'lot
of enslavement, bondage.' In all these locutions the notion
of 'binding, bondage, constraint' lies clear. Not but that I
think that ἐνεγκεῖν 'portare' is a true cognate of ἀνάγκη; only
'portare' seems to me a secondary meaning, while the primary
meaning, lost in the Greek verb, was 'pangere, nectere.'

To the base ENEK- belong the following: (1) ὄγκος[1] 'barb
of an arrow,' Lat. *uncus* 'hook,' Lith. *ánka* 'knot, loop, noose'
(cf. ὄγκος[2] 'knot of hair'), O.H.G. *ango* 'point, arrow-point';
(2) ὄγκος[2] 'mass, weight,' — *i.e.* 'pack.' It is from 'pack'
that I hope to clear up the definition of 'portare.' The first

definition of *pack* in Stormonth's dictionary is 'a bundle or bale tied up for convenient carriage'; and so the Hatzfeld-Darmesteter-Thomas lexicon defines French *paquet* by 'assemblage de plusieurs choses liées, envellopées ensemble.' It is immaterial whether with Koerting (*Lat.-roman. Woert.*[2], *s.v. pac-, pag-;* cf. also Skeat, *Concise Dict., s.v. pack*) we ultimately derive *paquet, pack* from Lat. *pango* or not, — the point is that a *pack* is 'a tied bundle,' and that in English *packs* means 'carries (a bundle), bears.' Note also that German *trag-riemen* 'carrying-strap' furnishes a semantic line from Lith. *ánka* direct to ἐνεγκεῖν 'portare.'

The base I have written as ENEK- does not differ from the base usually written ENEK̑- (cf. Prellwitz, *s.v.* ἐνεγκεῖν, and Walde, *s.v. nanciscor*). The -*k̑*- form of root finally got the upper hand for reasons set forth by Hirt in *BB.* XXIV, 287. The base originally meant 'to pierce, strike, cut,' — a chain of meanings that may be exemplified by Gr. πάσσα-λος 'nail, peg' (Lat. *pangere*), — whence it passed over to the sense of 'iungere, nectere,' which we may exemplify by Skr. *páç/pā́ças* 'rope, lash' (for the signification, cf. the author in *AJP.* XXVI, 177, L.). The sense of 'bend,' often conceived as the primitive of Lat. *uncus* 'hook,' may have developed secondarily from the sense 'binds' (*ib.* 378, T. β), but in view of O.H.G. *ango* 'point, arrow-point,' it is not at all unlikely that the sense of 'bent' originated by metaphor from the (barbed) arrow-point (cf. γλυφίς).

But the sense 'ferre, portare,' derived above from the notion of 'pack,' may have come directly from the sense of 'strike, hit.' An important carrying act of the neolithic man must have been the bringing to his abode of the spoils of the chase; and for heavier burdens he would have employed a pole swung on two shoulders, that pole possibly the shaft or spear with which the game had been slain. With this consideration in mind we may develop the notion 'portare' either from 'nectere' (by means of a *trag-riemen*[1]), or from

---

[1] An intermediate term between 'caedit' and 'fert' would be 'trahit,' perhaps (cf. Span. *trae* 'portat' = Lat. *trahit*). This allows the identification of Lat. *trahit* 'zerrt' with O. Bulg. *trŭzati* 'reissen,' Skr. *tṛnédhi* 'zerreist' (cf. above, p. 7).

'ferire' (by means of the *aerumnula*, cf. the author, *l.c.*, XXV, 106).

It can hardly be an accident that 'portare' stands beside 'ferire' in three homophonous roots, and it is a counsel of despair to number homonyms without an attempt to resolve their definitions by semantic processes suited to the neolithic civilization. If we suppose a phonetic decay by the close of the primitive period equal to the Romance detrition as compared with Latin, we block semantics for good and all. The following homonyms are then to be noted: ἤνεγκε 'portavit' (base ENEK̂-) : *necat* 'ferit, slays' (base NEK̂-, cf. the author, *l.c.*, XXVI, 193). Here also, from a parallel base ENE-G̑H-, ἐνήνοχε[1] 'portavit' : ἔγχος 'spear' (cf. Prellwitz, *s.v.* ἔγχος, and the author, *l.c.*, XXV, 382). Further, Lat. *fert* 'portat' and *ferit* 'strikes' have a common base BHERĒ(Y)-[2] (cf. Reichelt, *KZ.* XXIX, 19, 35); while Lat. *portat* (cf. Walde,[3] *s.v.*) ultimately comes from the base PERĒ(Y)- (cf. Reichelt, *l.c.*, p. 22) 'caedere, ferire.'

In Latin, *necessarii* has the sense of 'affines, connections,' and *necessitudo/necessitas* of 'affinitas.' Aulus Gellius, xiii, 3, comments on this as follows: sed necessitas sane pro iure officioque observantiae adfinitatisve infrequens est, quamquam, qui ob hoc ipsum ius adfinitatis familiaritatisque coniuncti sunt, 'necessarii' dicuntur. Here, again, the sense of 'constraint' in *necessitas* is easily and naturally derived from the sense of 'tying, binding'; but how does the current etymology, starting from 'the inevitable, unyielding,' account satisfactorily for the sense 'affines'? It is at least as forced as the passage in ἡ ἀνάγκη from 'the bringer' to 'affinitas'

---

[1] Note Brugmann's (*IF.* XII, 153) attractive explanation of Germ. *bringen* as a blend of BHER- and ENEK̂-, better ENEG̑H-.

[2] The Greek 2d and 3d sg. forms like φάρεις, φάρει are derived from such bases in -EY + the "secondary" endings, -s and -*t*. So also the imperfect forms ἐτίθεις, ἐτίθει come from the base DHĒY- (cf. Sanskrit *dhīydte*). Thus φάρεις and Lat. *ferīs*, though of a different grade in their "root" part, may be equivalent in their "stem" part. On the εις- and ει- of the nasal verbs see *AJP.* XXV, 387, n. 2.

[3] Let who will think that the neolithic Aryan thought in terms like "Vollendung einer nach vorwaerts gerichteten Handlung, Durchdringen durch etwas."

(that is, strictly, ' consanguinitas, necessitas '). Accordingly,
I am convinced that in the locution (*mihi*) *necesse est* we
must seek for some original sense like that of the English ' I
am bound.'[1] Morphologically, *necesse* is, I take it, a locative
plural from a stem *neces-*, attested for the base ENEK̂- (in a
different sense, to be sure) by Gr. ποδηνεκές ' foot-reaching '(cf.
ποδήρης).[2] A comparable formation is the adverb *temere* (loc.
sg., see Walde, *s.v.*); syntactically, the plural may be illus-
trated by *compedes, casses* (in the literal sense), and by *nuptiae,
sponsalia, indutiae, vindiciae* (in a figurative sense). Thus I
would understand the locution *necesse est hoc facere* to adum-
brate an original sense like ' it is in the bonds to do this.'

It remains to say a word about the derivatives of *necesse*.
Since the serious defence of *necessis* as a genuine abstract
noun by Brugmann, Skutsch, and Zimmermann (references
in Walde), it seems necessary to avow the conviction that
scholars like Munro were right when they explained the gen.
form *necessis* (Lucretius, vi, 815) as gen. to *necesse*, conceived
as a neuter adj.; the writer who could say *natura . . . inanis*
(i, 363) and *plus . . . inanis* (*ib.* 365), — *inanis* being in both
passages a gen. of *inane*, and in both a line end, — may be
supposed to have used *necessis* in *magna vis . . . necessis* (by
certain conjecture for *necessest*) as a gen. to *necesse*.

But Lucretius, who used *momen* for *momentum*, seems to
me quite capable of having used *necessis* as a short form of
necessitas outright; just as Henry Porter, no mean dramatic
poet, uses, in *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon*, ' enter-
tain ' for ' entertainment,' ' attain ' for ' attainment,' ' maintain '
for ' maintenance,' ' depart ' for ' departure,' ' persuase ' for
' persuasion,' ' suspect ' for ' suspicion '; and he would have
had a sort of pattern for *necessis* in *ravis* ' hoarseness '; note
also pairs like *facul/facultas, volup/voluptas*, as (incorrectly)
interpreted by Donatus (cited below).

The remaining forms to account for are *necessum* (Plautus

---

[1] The older etymologists were right, in my opinion, when they connected δεῖ
' necesse est ' with δέω ' vincio.'

[2] We might define ποδηνεκής by ' foot-binding ' and ποδήρης by ' foot-joining,'
whence, for both, ' foot-reaching.'

and subsequently) and *necessus* (*S. C. de Bacch.*, Plautus once(?) and Terence). Donatus (or rather a scholiast, cf. the preface to Wessner's edition, p. xlvi), in his comment on Terence, *Eun.* 998, necessus fuit hoc facere, writes : necessus nomen est, nam necessus et necessis et necessitas et necessum lectum est.[1] This account of *necessus* I believe to be substantially correct, but instead of taking *necessus* for an abstract in -TU-, and interpreting as **ne cessus est*, quasi 'nullus abitus est,' I am content to think that *necessus* is *necesse* after the analogy of · its associates, *opus* and *usus*, has taken effect. The natural interpretation of *S. C. de Bacch.*, SEIQUES ESENT QUEI SIBEI DEICERENT NECESUS ESE BACANAL HABERE, etc., is to take NECESUS as a neuter, like *opus*. True, Skutsch would have NECESUS ESE and *necessum est* (*Ru.* 133) arise, the one from the influence of *necessus est* and the other from *necessum esse*. Besides this instance of the sumptio (ad absurdum) method,. others explain NECESUS here as a predicate gen. of a -*u*- stem (see, *e.g.*, Giussani, *ad* Lucr. vi, 815).

If we have been able to account for the one occurrence of *necessis* so simply, and without violence to the usage of Lucretius, and if *necessus* is more completely accounted for by assuming the analogy of *opus* and *usus*, it is still difficult to account for the doublet *necesse/necessum*. True, one or two similar pairs may be cited for Plautus or the Plautine period,[2] viz., *hilare/hilarum*, *sublime/sublimum*, but their semantic spheres are too different to make probable the operation of any but the most general formal analogy. If we assume that *necessĕ* was felt as an adverb, formal analogy must have led rather to *necessis -e*, than to *necessus -um ;* nor

---

[1] Whether the scholiast means by *lectum est* to denote his acquaintance with the four words cited, or means that each of the four has been applied to the interpretation of the passage (cf. *ad Eun.* 1022, et 'edent' et 'edet' legitur), we might suspect any professional commentator of having known Lucretius' solitary use of *necessis*, and we may appraise his interpretation of *necessis* as we do his account of *volup* (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* 553) : hoc volup nomen est, ut hoc facul, sic enim per ἀποκοπήν veteres loquebantur. If **necessis* were a proved fem. abstract, its relation to *necessitas* might be illustrated by *ravis* : **ravitas* 'hoarseness' ; *pinguis* (? cf. abl. *pinguī*, Lucretius, i, 257) : *pinguitudo*.

[2] See the list in Hodgman's "Adjectival Forms in Plautus," *Class. Rev.*, Dec., 1902, sub V.

is it at all safe to imagine that *necessum* is such a match for *necessitas* as *aequom* for *aequitas ;* but it is rather to the analogy of *usus* that we must again resort. Nobody, I suppose, any longer questions that *opus est* got its ablative construction from *usus est ;* and it seems to me beyond question that *opus est*, which finally ousted *usus est*, was the idiom of subsequent development; and I take it that *necessum esse* (*or. obl.*, cf. *Miles*, 1118) was of earlier origin than NECESUS ESE, the one being the analogical substitute for *usum esse*, the other for *opus esse ;* the further step in the development is to assume that, to the pair *necesse esse* (cf. *Asin.* 24)/*necessum esse*, a corresponding pair *necesse est*/*necessum est* developed.[1]

For the definition given to *necesse*, I have always felt that Horace might be cited as an expert witness in the following contexts :

(1) si figit adamantinos
summis verticibus dira Necessitas
clavos, etc. (*C.* iii, 24, 5) ;

(2) Te (*sc.* Fortunam) semper anteit saeva Necessitas,
clavos trabalis et cuneos manu
gestans aena, nec severus
uncus abest liquidumque plumbum (i, 35, 17).

In both these passages *Necessitas* carries nails (*clavos*), and the second represents her as also furnished with wedges (*cuneos*), which were rather for joining than for splitting,[2] the clamp (*uncus*),[3] and molten lead (*liquidum plumbum*).

---

[1] Lucretius, ii, 289, has *necessum intestinum*, accusative, a simple extension to one who also used *necessum est* (ii, 468). Attention may also be called to the parallelism of *necesse* and the German adverbial locution *vonnoeten*, both being construed only with the verbs 'to be' and 'to have.'

[2] Cf. *cuneare* 'to mortise,' Pliny the Elder ; Ovid, *Met.* xi, 51, 4, cited by Lewis and Short ; and Cicero, *Tusc.* ii, 23, where the impaled Prometheus says,

Hos ille cuneos fabrica crudeli *inserens*
Perrupit artus ; qua miser sollertia
Transverberatus castrum hoc Furiarum incolo.

[3] I interpret *uncus* with Forcellini-Corradini as 'ferrum quo lapides seu lateres simul iuncti continentur'; so also, among American and English scholars, Shorey, Smith, Bennett, and Page, in their editions, and Gemoll in *Die Realien bei*

With such a collection of devices for stoutly binding together, we are privileged to regard Necessitas as the 'joiner,' *par excellence*, without working out a specific picture of her as a carpenter's 'prentice (see Shorey, *ad loc.*).

The definitions of *Necessitas, necessarii*, and *necessitudo* seem to me to require their derivation from a cognate of *nec-tit* 'binds,' and the same explanation suits *necesse* most aptly. Nor is this a new, however unprompted, explanation; cf. Forcellini-Corradini, *s.v. nectere :* 'intensivum esse videtur ab inus. necere et, ratione etymi habita, coniungi potest cum necesse et Germ. naehen.'

The base (E)NEK̂- has Latin forms in *nex-*, but all of them may have come from *nect-t-* and must be dismissed from the discussion ; but it is worth noting that this base appears in two words that may be treated as compounds, viz. : *vincit* 'binds,' and *sancit* ('binds and) reserves for a designated use,' quasi 'vovet.' In these words I would see tautological complexes[1] (see the author in *AJP.* XXV, 183, 184; XXVI, 395), the one, of the bases wĕ(y)- and ENEK̂-, the other, of the bases sĕ(y)- and ENEK̂-.

As to the locative ending *-si* found in *necesse*, it has not been certainly traced outside of Greek (see Brugmann, *Griech. Gram.*[3] § 270, Anm.), but it seems to me to be extant in one other Latin word, viz. : —

(3) *Vicissim* '*by turns.*'

I am unable to say who originally suggested that *vicissim* was a locative, and in *Class. Rev.* XI, 144, I considered and

---

Horaz, IV, 111, — all counter to Kiessling's interpretation by 'torture-hook' (so also Stowasser, *Lex., s.v.*). The adaptability of the *uncus* for clamping is also attested by Columella, iii, 18 (cited by F.-C.) : deinde quicquid recurvum et sursum versus spectans demersum est cum tempestivum eximitur in modum hami repugnat obluctanti fossori, et velut uncus infixus solo antequam extrahatur praerumpitur.

[1] Tautological complexes range from "blended" words like Eng. *squench* (see Bloomfield in *IF.* IV, 71) to formal synonym-compounds such as are made in Chinese (see Misteli in Steinthal-Misteli's *Abriss der Sprachwissenschaft*, II, 162). Not unlike the Chinese type are Germ. *bringen* as explained above, and Ital. *fracassare*, if from *frag + quassare* (so Körting's *Latein.-roman. Woerterbuch*).

rejected the view, making *vicissim* an extension, under the influence of the somewhat synonymous *partim*, of an adverbial accus. plur. *vicis* (plur. to *vicem* 'in turn'; cf. *in vicem*, *in vices*); and the adverbial form *vice* may be a corresponding use of the locative singular. A stem *vices-* is not to be found in Latin, outside of this form, it is true, but Germ. *wechsel*, referred by Kluge to a base WIK-SLA, might as well be ascribed to WIK-S-LA. The analogy of *interim* and *partim*, in conjunction with Latin vowel levelling, will account for *vicissim* instead of **vicesse; vicissatim* is of secondary origin like *interatim, interduatim* (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 566).

(4) *Severus;* αὐστηρός.

Walde's explanation of *severus* fails to satisfy: *sĕ-* 'sine' is very far from certain, and **vēro-* 'abscheu' (: *vereor*) an otherwise unattested stem. It may presently be seen, from the examples to be quoted, that this sense is not particularly apt for the usage of *severus*. The other explanations cited — I have not been able to consult Brugmann, *Berichte*, etc. — are either phonetically unsound or semantically inapt.

In attacking the problem, it must first be noted that the *ĕ* of *sĕverus* cannot be original — unless we call in the aid of vowel levelling — but may stand for *ē*, shortened by the rule, 'vocalis ante vocalem corripitur,' which seems to operate even through *-v-* (cf. Solmsen, *KZ.* XXXVII, 12, n.).

In the attempt to fix the somewhat elusive sense of *severus*, the following examples may be noted: —

(1) nam te (*sc.* Neptunum) omnes saeuomque seuerumque
   atque auidis moribus commemorant (*Trin.* 825).

(2) quem ad modum astitit, seuero fronte curans, cogitans
   (*Miles*, 201).

(3) opino hercle hodie, quod ego dixi per iocum,
   id euenturum esse et seuerum et serium (*Poen.* 1169).

(4) hoc nemo fuit minus ineptus, magis seuerus quisquam,
   nec magis continens (*Eun.* 227).

(5) sed ipse egreditur, quam seuerus! rem quom uideas,
   censeas (*Heaut.* 1023).

To this complete list of examples from Plautus and Terence, I add the following: (6) severus uncus (Hor. *C.* i, 35, cited above); (7) severum Falernum (*ib.* i, 27. 9); (8) quod potius factum tum luxuriosi (Mss -e) quam severi (Mss -e) boni viri laudabant (Varro, *R.R.* iii, 6, 6); (9) rumoresque senum severiorum (Catullus, 5, 3).

In some of these contexts, English 'tart' or Gr. δριμύς furnishes an excellent rendering, viz.: in 1, 5, 7, 9. The primary sense of *tart* (: δριμύς 'tart' : δέρει 'flays') is 'piercing, sharp'; and the *severus uncus* (6) must have been 'notched, barbed.' The tenacity of the *uncus* (cf. Col. iii, 18, cited above) was due to its lateral barbs, which 'cut in.' We see from this context how the notion of 'tenacious, steadfast, enduring, sure,' would arise in the mechanical arts; cf. the verb *perseverat.* We may picture a conventionalized *uncus* to ourselves as a sort of double arrow ◄——►. The generalized sense of 'sure' satisfies examples 3, 4, 8. This leaves us *seuero fronte* (2) 'with angry brow,' which might be compared with example (5), or defined concretely by 'with knitted, drawn, anxious brow.' Semantically this sense is like that of *strictus*, as set down by Walde.

In view of these passages, which represent with some thoroughness, I take it, the usage of *severus*, it is clear that a base with a sense of 'figit' = 'stecht, stickt' will answer to the range of *severus;* such a base is sĕ(ɣ)-, extended in Lat. *sica* 'dagger,' *secat* 'cuts,' and further exhibited by O. Sax. *saijan* 'to sew,' Skr. *syáti* 'binds' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Woert.,* *s.v.*; and see further *AJP.* XXVI, 183). Cognate with *severus*, thus explained, is *saevus* (cf. *Trin.* 825, cited above); nor is it impossible that *sevĕrus* has been shortened from *saevĕrus*.

For the sense of 'binds' note also Skr. *sáram* 'festigkeit' (cf. Gr. πηκτός), and the Latin glosses *serio* 'necessario,' *serius homo* 'id est necessarius.' Or the sense of 'hard, compact' may come directly from the sense of 'striking.' Thus we have Skr. *ghanás* 'compact' (: √*han* 'caedere, κόπτειν'); note also σκιρρός, if for σκιρός, to the base s)κ(ʜ)ĕ(ɣ)- 'caedere' (see *AJP.* XXVI, 396, and Walde, *s.v. scio*). With σκιρρός 'hard' belong σκῖρον 'parings of cheese' (cf. the

sense of 'coating, cover, scum,' in σκῖρος), σκῖρος 'copse-land (= French *taille*), a stump.'

As to the suffix, I assume a verb *sevēre* (? *saevēre*, a doublet of *saevire*) whence *sevērus*, as ὀκνηρός : ὀκνεῖ (cf. Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*[3] § 202, 3); cf. also *avarus* : *avare* (doublet of *avēre*, as *densare* of *densēre*).

Inasmuch as Lat. *severus* forms a conceptual group in most minds with Gr. αὐστηρός, a few words over the latter here. Both words mean 'astringent, bitter,' in a concrete way, and 'strict' as moral terms. In the Plato context where it is defined 'astringent' (*Tim.* 65 D), it denotes a lesser degree of astringency than στρυφνός;[1] but στρυφνός is to be connected with στρέφει 'turns, twists'; cf. Du. *wrang* 'acid, sour,' cognate with Eng. *wrings* 'twists,' "because acids wring the mouth" (quoted from Skeat, *op. cit. s.v.*, wrong); so Lucretius (ii, 401), speaking of astringent tastes, observes, foedo pertorquent ora sapore.

Is there likewise a concrete etymon for αὐστηρός? It would seem from Skr. *niṣṭhura-s* 'asper' (see *asper* in Walde, and note Terentian *asperum vinum*) that -στηρος and -*ṣṭhuras* may derive from a common source, viz., a base s)TER- 'to pierce,' found in Lat. *terit* 'rubs,' *terebra* 'auger' (see Walde, *s.v. stringo*). The same base (not a different one, *pace* Walde, *l.c.*) means 'to turn, twist,' — a metaphor derived from boring with an auger; and so -στηρος, -*ṣṭhuras* may be cognate with Lat. *str-ic-tus* (cf. *astrictus* 'astringent'): *stringit*.[2]

To the base s)TER- 'to pierce' belongs *stercus* 'dung' (named from its pungent odor), *sterilis*, with a sense of *strictus* (= compressus, compact, strong; cf. Skr. *star-í-s* 'strength'), and a further derived sense of 'barren' (= non compos Veneris? cf. Skr. *star-í-s* 'vacca sterilis'); for the sense of 'rough' note Gothic *and-staurran* 'to be shrewish.'

---

[1] On the υ of στρυφνός, cf. Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*[3] § 66, Anm. 1.

[2] Not a bad illustration of a contaminated or, to use a better term, composite base may be seen in *stringit* and its Greek cognate στραγγαλᾷ 'chokes, throttles': here the *str-* belongs to the base s)TER-, while -αγγ-, and, in a different vowel stage, -*ing*-, belong with the root of Lat. *angit* 'throttles' (on -γγ- for -γχ-, see Brugmann, *KvGr.* § 261, 6).

If we are right in grouping *ni-sṭhuras* and αὐστηρός, αὐ-must either be part of a tautological compound or a preposition (see Walde, *s.v. au-*); and if we may account for the sense of *ni-sṭhuras* from 'rubbing down into, scratching, rough,' we may define αὐστηρός by 'off-rubbing, off-twisting, off-turning' (=asper, repellent). With *nisṭhuras* cf. *ni-strim-ças* 'crudelis; ensis,' *-strimç-* being cognate with *stringit,* but with a different root final.

As to the sense, I note two Sanskrit words meaning 'astringent': (1) *rūkṣá-s,* connected by Uhlenbeck with Lith. *runkù* 'I am wrinkled' (*wrinkle : wrings,* Du. *wrang,* previously mentioned), and also with Lat. *runcina* 'plane,' Gr. ὀρύσσει 'digs'; (2) *kaṣāyas,* which belongs with *kaṣati* 'rubs, scrapes'; further note Lucretius, ii, 405, haec (*sc.* amara et aspera) magis *hamatis* inter se nexa teneri.

(5) *amarus, amoenus, amat.*

The derivation of *amat* from a pet name for mother, and the definition of *amoenus* as 'suburban,' both accepted by Walde, seem to me to lack real parallels.   In Plautus, *amat* is a verb of sexual love, and this sense continues into the lyric poets (cf. Pichon, *De Sermone Amatorio*); also note *amica* of the beloved.   For my part, I believe that the primary signification of *amat* is ἔραται, and not ἀγαπᾷ.   Stowasser's original study of *amoenus* is not accessible to me, but as represented in his own lexicon and in Walde's summary, the connection made with *moenia* 'walls' all rests on the fact that Latin authors pronounced sundry suburban spots *amoena.*   All very true, but Homer pronounced not a few places ἐραννά or ἐρατεινά, and I am fain to believe, therefore, that *amoenus* means 'lovely,' and not 'suburban.' [1]

In seeking for the original sense of *amat,* we must not leave out of the count *amārus* 'bitter.'

---

[1] Plautus seemed to feel (but that may of course have been a popular etymology, or even a pun) a connection between *amare* and *amoenus ;* cf.

> *Merc.* 356 hocine est amare?   arare mauelim, quam sic amare.
> 359 ubi uoluptatem aegritudo uincat, quid ibi inest amoeni?

Giving to *amarus* 'bitter' (cf. also Skr. *amla-s* 'sour') a primitive sense of 'biting, piercing,' the semantic correlation with *amat* 'loves' has an explanation suggested in the following: "'Biting' is a well-known gesture of physical pleasure (cf., *e.g.*, for the Roman poets, *morsus* in Pichon's *De Serm. Amat., s.v.*), and plays a rôle in the sexual life of animals" (*AJP.* XXVI, 201; see also Havelock Ellis, p. 107 of the work to be cited, where the horning of does by stags is mentioned).

This subject is treated at length by Havelock Ellis in his *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, particularly as regards "Sadism" (p. 88 sq.), or "algolagnia" (p. 101). The Hindu *Ars Amatoria* has a chapter on striking as a love stimulus (ii, 7, 15–16, in Schmidt's *Kāmasūtram*); cf. further on the love-bite, Ellis, *l.c.*, pp. 65, 101, and also note the entries *proelium* and *pugna*, with their respective verbs, as given by Pichon in the work already cited; *e.g.*, Propertius, ii, 1, 45, angusto versantes proelia lecto; Ovid, *Ars Amat.* i, 665:

> pugnabit primo fortassis et "improbe" dicet;
> pugnando vinci se tamen illa volet.

Resting on this physiological foundation, there is no reason to reject off-hand the suggestion that *amarus* 'bitter' may be cognate with *amat* 'loves' (*i.e.* ἔραται). Note also Skr. *ari-s* 'cupidus)(hostilis,' and ἔραται 'amat': ἔρις 'rixa,' all of which belong to the base Ē̆RĒ(Y)- 'caedere' (see *AJP.* XXVI, 389). To this base ἀρόει and *arat*, both verbs of sexual connotation (see the lexica), also belong.[1] Shakespeare may also be cited for "He that *ears* my land spares my team," though this may be of Hebraic origin; cf., in the Vulgate, *Jud.* 14, 18, nisi arassetis in vitula mea: ἄροτρον 'plough' of the organs of generation.[2]

---

[1] On the relation of the ideas of 'arat' and 'coit' (= *amat*), see Meringer, *IF.* XVI, 181 sq., — though his order of semantic development is just the converse of mine (*AJP. ib.* 407, n. 4).

[2] The metaphor of the sexual ploughing is fully developed in Lucretius, iv, 1272. For the Plautus examples of *arare* in this sense (viz. *Asin.* 874, *Truc.* 149, to which we should perhaps add *Merc.* 356, cited above), see the *Thesaurus*, II, 627, 55. In *The Spanish Curate*, II, 3 (p. 245 in the Mermaid text), Beau-

The base to which I assign *amarus, amoenus,* and *amat* is
to be written AMḔ(Y)-, and given the primary sense of 'figit-
caedit' (*i.e.* 'pierces'), and a secondary sense of 'figit-pangit'
(ultimately = vincit, iungit). This is the base I have writ-
ten MḔ(Y)- in *AJP. ib.* 176, and which is given as MEYE- by
Walde, *s.v. moenia.* Hirt writes it as EMAˣ- (*Ablaut,* 335), but
this does not account for the -*ī*- of Skr. *amīti,* nor the *ay* of
Avest. *amayavā-.* The sense of (1) 'caedit, κόπτει,' with the
natural transfers to the mental and emotional sphere, I find
in the following: ἄμη 'mattock,' ἀμάρα 'pit'; Skr. *mayūkha-s*
'peg, ray,' Germ. *ameise* = 'ant,' μίτυλος 'curtus,' Lat. *ama-
rus* 'bitter,' Skr. *amítram* 'hostis' (accent not normal for a
compound with *a*-privative, cf. Whitney, *Skr. Gram.* § 1288, d),
Skr. *míthu-s* 'false.' Generalized from 'caedit' is (2) 'premit,
urget.' We have this sense in Avest. *ama-* 'impetus, might'
(morphologically comparable with ἔρος/ἔρως : ERḔ(Y)-), also
used of sexual virility (cf. Bartholomae, *Woert., s.v.*). Here
also Avest. *amayavā-* 'labor, dolor.' In the Rig Veda we
have *ámavat-* of the Soma press-stones, and contexts like
8, 77 (66), 10, *varáham emuṣám* 'verrem urgentem,' 5, 87, 5,
ámavān — vṛ́ṣā 'urgens taurus' (?), 7, 24, 2, *çnathihy amítrān
abhí yé no . . . amánti* 'caede hostes (= prementes) qui nos
. . . comprimunt.'

Further differentiated is (3), a sense like 'pangit, vincit.'
This sense is well attested for *sam +* √*am-* in Sanskrit[1]; cf.
further Avest. *miθra-* 'compact,' μίτρα 'infula, ζώνη,' μίτος
'thread, string,' (?) Lat. *red-imītus* 'vinctus,' Skr. *mithund-*
'pair, ζεῦγος' (= iuncti amici), *mitá-s* 'vinctus.'

Again (4), with mercantile sense, — but whether this came
from the sense of 'compact' or was rather developed as

mont and Fletcher echo *Judges* 14, 18, in the line 'Plough with his fine white
heifer.' In view of the sexual ploughing, I see no reason to doubt the connec-
tion of ἔραται with *arat,* unless we mean to divorce Cymric *erw* (see Stokes in
Fick's *Woert.*⁴ II, p. 41) from Lat. *arvum.* The *e*-vocalism appears also in the
group of which ἐρέτης 'oarsman' may be taken as the representative. I agree
with Meringer (*IF.* XVII, 122) that it is semantically incredible to divorce the
'rowing' from the 'ploughing' group, especially in the light of *Æneid,* iv, 399,
frondentesque ferunt remos et robora silvis | infabricata (*remos : ramos*).

[1] Uhlenbeck renders the simplex *dmīti* by 'versichert eindringlich.'

in Germ. *schlag* (see *AJP. ib.* 176, n. 3), it were hard to determine — ἀμοιβή, μοῖτος / μοῖνος 'recompense' (cf. Lat. *munus* 'present'); ἀμείβει, Skr. *máyate*, Lat. *mūtat* 'exchanges' (? here Lat. *emit* 'buys'). This notion of exchanging may have given rise to the notion of 'friendship,' but I think rather that 'amicitia' arose after 'ἔρως' (cf. Skr. *arí-s, aryá-s*, entered by Prellwitz *s.v.* ἔραμαι), perhaps merely as pairs (coniuges) grew old. In the order of moral evolution (1) *amica* 'ἡ ἐρωμένη' (? μοιχός 'paramour') gave way to (2) *amica*, quasi 'comes amata.' The word *lust* has had in German (see Heyne's *Woerterbuch*) a very similar semantic development. Our English *lust* still corresponds, morally, to (1) *amica*, while Germ. *lust* is in the stage of (2) *amica* (cf. Skr. *máyas-* 'gaudium').

As to the form of *amoenus*, the diphthong in the posttonic syllable causes difficulty; so does the tonic *oe* of *moenia*, in which Sommer recognizes (*Lat. Gram.*, p. 89) a psycho-phonetic influence, and the post-tonic *oe* of *oboedit* (see Havet, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* IV, 410); cf. also *lagoena* 'flagon,' borrowed from λάγυνος (*lagoena* 'wine-flagon' has perhaps been affected by a popular connection with *oenopolium* 'wine-shop'). But *amoenus* need not be explained as an immediate counterpart of primitive AMOINOS. I suggest, in view of Avest. *amayavā-* (= Skr. *ámīvā-*), cited above, that we put as the Lat. startform *ámoye(s)nos > ámŏĕnos > ámoenus*, but ἀμεινο- would suggest a different startform (cf. Prellwitz, *s.v.* ἀμείνων).

It remains to add a few words on other Latin cognates, or possible cognates, of this group. The gloss *amoenavit* 'densavit' might be interpreted, not as a denominative to *amoenus*, but directly as a verb of nasal flexion, from the base AMĔ(Y)- 'premit.'

For *emit* (if from *m̥m-*) 'buys' the older meaning was 'accipit' (so Paulus-Festus); cf. the compounds *adimit* 'ad se accipit,' *sumit* 'takes up,' senses that all derive very naturally from 'exchanges.' Not but that the sense of 'takes' (gets) may have been directly derived from 'strikes,' as in Lat. *nanciscitur* (cf. *AJP.* XXVI, 193); and note Lat. *capit* 'takes': κόπτει

'strikes, cuts,' for the notions of 'striking' (cutting) and
'taking' (obtaining) are, *pace* Walde, *s.v. capio,* capable of
being united; cf. Eng. *hits* 'strikes, lights upon, attains to' :
Swed. *hitta* ' to find.' The sphere of activity in which these
notions come together is in the chase (cf. *AJP. l.c.,* adding
κῠρεῖ/κῠρει to τυγχάνει).

In view of ἀμᾷ 'mows, reaps' (*i.e.* ' cuts,' with a long-grade
ā-), we may wonder if (1) Lat. *āmentum* 'strap for binding' [1]
and (2) *āmes* 'notch, furca,' *hāmus* 'hook' (if with inorganic
h-), do not also belong to AMĔ(Y)- in the senses of (1) 'pangit,
vincit,' (2) 'caedit' (the notch being 'what is cut in'). The
words *ansa* and *ampla* 'handle,' referred by Walde to a root
am- ' to grasp,' may also belong to our base, whether we think
of a handle as a ' notch ' or as a projecting ' knob ' or ' peg '
(cf. Skr. *karṇá-s* ' ear, handle,' Graeco-Latin *diota* 'two-eared
jug '), *i.e.* πάσσαλος.

Attention is also called to the following rhyming synonyms
of AMĔ(Y)-, viz., Lat. *premit* (if from *pṛmméti*) and Skr. √*kam-*
' amat '; for in rhyming synonyms we may suspect, at least
to a limited extent, a common origin of the phonetic elements
common to all members of a group (cf. my remark on Lat.
apio, capio, rapio in *AJP.* XXV, 373). In the *Dhātupāṭha*
Skr. √*am-* is defined as ' ehren,' no wide remove from *amare*
and √*kam-*.

(6) *frangit, frēgit.*

Has no one yet suggested that in *frangit* we have a blend
of the bases of Skr. *bhanákti* 'frangit' (: √*bhañj-*) and of
ῥήγνυσι ' frangit '?

Postscripta : P. 7. Cf. *tractabant = arabant, occabant* (?), Lucr. v,
1289.

P. 17. Lucretius, v, 1190, writes *signa severa* for *stellae inerrantes.*

P. 20. On the love-lick, also see Crawley, *The Mystic Rose,*
p. 353 sq.; noting, "When analyzed, the emotion [love] always

---

[1] But Greek ἔναμμα — if not suggested, as its time of appearance would admit,
by *amentum* — would seem to make for Vaniček's derivation of *ammentum* from
*apmentum.

comes back to contact " (p. 77); " Primitive physics, no less than modern, recognizes that contact is a modified form of blow " (p. 79).

P. 21. Hirt writes *ema^x* with *e* because of O. H. G. *emazzig*, whose *ę*, it would seem, may be mutated *a*; cf. the forms *ęmizzig* and *ęmiz* in Kluge's *Woert.*, *s.vv. emsig* and *ameise*.

Δεύτεραι φροντίδες.

P. 6. A trace of the specific sense ' pulls,' assigned as the primitive signification of *accersit*, would seem to be extant in a proverb-like phrase in Plautus, *Am.* 327 :

illic homo a me sibi malam rem arcessit iumento suo,

" the fellow is pulling a beating from me on his head with his own team."

A very special usage of *accersit*, well attested in Plautus and Terence, is in the sense ' fetches the bride forth ' (see the *Thesaurus*, II, 452, 51), spoken of the bridegroom and of others who bring forth the bride.   Its special appropriateness to the Roman bridegroom is clear from Festus, p. 289, rapi simulatur virgo ex gremio matris (cf. also Catullus, lxi, 3, 58 ; Apuleius, *Met.* iv, 26 ; Macrobius, *Sat.* i, 15, 21). The Plautine instance is *Aul.* 613 :

ne adfinem morer
quin ubi accersat meam extemplo filiam ducat domum ;

that is to say, being interpreted, that there was an *accersio* by the bridegroom prior to the *domum deductio*.   The bride's natural shyness and reluctance may have made it necessary for others also, as well as the bridegroom, to pull her about as preparations for the wedding were making.   For instances of such reluctance in all manner of savage tribes see Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, p. 354 sq.

P. 7. Schulze (*Latein. Eigennamen*, 209) asks whether the name *Perternius* has not arisen beside *Peternius*, owing to " Vorausnahme des *r*."

P. 15. Schmidt's Hesychius has the following entry : νέξας · τὰ στρώματα (Aeol. ?).   The current assumption, that in Latin √*nedh*-yielded *nectit* under the influence of *plectit*, is not more reasonable than that √*nedh*- ' vincere ' was affected in the proethnic period by the base of Skr. *páç* ' vinculum,' whence the secondary (?) root *nek̂*-.